DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 131 215 CE 008 150

TITLE	Study of Community Education in Region V. Report I: Components of Exemplary Community Education Programs in Michigan.
INSTITUTION	Wisconsin State Dept. of Public Instruction, Madison.
SPONS AGENCY	Office of Education (DHEW), Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	Jan 76
NOTE	43p.
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.83 HC-$2.06 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Community Education; *Community Programs; *Community Schools; *Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Rural Areas; *State Programs; Success Factors; Urban Areas
IDENTIFIERS	*Exemplary Community Education Programs; *Michigan

ABSTRACT

A 55-item questionnaire was distributed to all of the Community School Programs in Michigan which were partially reimbursed by the State in 1975-76. Ninety-eight percent of the questionnaires were returned. Thirteen components existed in over 90% of the programs and are considered to be necessary for a viable Community School Program. The results of the study indicate that the necessary components for all Community Programs are (1) the Board supports community education by opening the school building, (2) the program attracts most segments of the community, (3) program activities are started as soon as possible after needs have been identified, (4) an advisory committee is formed which helps to determine needs, establish goals, and identify community resource, (5) the director regularly attends inservice, (6) the program establishes cooperative efforts with governmental agencies, volunteer and civic service organizations, and other educational institutions, (7) the program has activities in the summer, and (8) evaluation of the program is based to some extent on the data collected on participants. In addition, components which differentiate successful from unsuccessful programs were identified for programs located in rural areas, in urban areas, in existence for three to six years, and in existance for over six years. These components are listed in the report along with recommendations for further research in community education, recommendations for community education programs, and recommendations for the State Department of Education. Appended to the report are (1) prediction models for all programs, for those grouped urban-rural, and for those grouped on length of program and (2) the questionnaire used to gather data. (Author/JT)

Documents acquired by ERIC include many informal unpublished materials not available from other sources. ERIC makes every effort to obtain the best copy available. Nevertheless, items of marginal reproducibility are often encountered and this affects the quality of the microfiche and hardcopy reproductions ERIC makes available via the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). EDRS is not responsible for the quality of the original document. Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made from the original.

ED131215

STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

IN REGION V

REPORT I

Components of Exemplary Community Education Programs in Michigan

Keith McNeil
Project Director of the Study of
Community Education in Region V
Director of Research and Evaluation Services
Educational Monitoring Systems
3449 Rentz, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

January 1976

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE 008 150

Interstate Project for
State Planning and Program Consolidation

Participating States	Chief State School Officers	Policy Committee
Illinois	Dr. Joseph M. Cronin	Mr. Emmett Slingsby
Indiana	Dr. Harold H. Negley	Mr. Ray Slaby
Michigan	Dr. John Porter	Mr. Alex Canja
Minnesota	Mr. Howard Casmey	Mr. Gregory J. Waddick
Ohio	Dr. Martin W. Essex	Dr. Paul Spayde
Wisconsin	Dr. Barbara Thompson	Dr. Archie Buchmiller

Dr. Robb L. Shanks
Project Director

Mr. Dexter Magers
USOE Coordinator

Project Office:

Wisconsin Department of Public Instruction
126 Langdon Street
Madison, Wisconsin 53702

Financed by funds provided under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-10, Title V, Sec. 505) and the sponsoring states. The activity which is the subject of this report was supported in whole or in part by the U. S. Office of Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. However, the opinions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the position or policy of the U. S. Office of Education, and no official endorsement by the U.S. Office of Education should be inferred.

PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This is the first of three reports on Community Education in Region V. The second report will focus on Community Education Programs in the states of Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio. The third will focus on the functions of State Department of Education Personnel responsible for Community Education.

The author would like to acknowledge the cooperation and assistance of several persons who made this study possible. Gary Sullenger, Community School Specialist of the Michigan Department of Education, coordinated the activities and provided much assistance in the wording of the questionnaire. His ranking of the Michigan Programs was a difficult, but necessary task for the completion of this study.

Dr. Robb Shanks and the Interstate Research Project Policy Committee provided encouragement and advice on the wording of the questionnaire.

Dr. Mary Rogers, Director of Adult and Continuing Education Services of the Michigan Department of Education sent a cover letter to all Superintendents which is the primary reason for the 98% response rate.

Two Community Education Directors in Michigan, Eugene Fisher of Saline and Don Kelso of Jackson, responded to a rough draft of the Survey and made several valuable suggestions.

Dr. William Kromer, Director of the National Center for Community Education also gave valuable input to the study.

Dr. Mike Hunter, Coordinator of General Program Evaluation in the Research, Evaluation and Assessment Service of the Michigan Department of Education provided the MDE estimate of the proportion of objectives met.

The 194 Directors of Community Education in Michigan made the most valuable contribution. With little more incentive than that "this study will further the concept of Community Education," they gave of their time to complete the questionnaire, and their responses provide the data for this report.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
UPPER MIDWEST REGIONAL INTERSTATE RESEARCH PROJECT POLICY COMMITTEE.	i
PREFACE AND ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
ABSTRACT	1
INTRODUCTION	4
DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	5
RESULTS.	6
Descriptive Results	7
Necessary Components of Community Education Programs.	10
Measures of Program Success	11
Formulation of Prediction Models.	14
Results: Components of Successful Programs	15
Results: Components of Successful Urban and Rural Programs . .	15
Results: Components of Successful Programs of Differing Lengths of Existence.	16
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.	17
REFERENCES	19
TABLE 4: PREDICTION MODELS FOR ALL PROGRAMS	21
TABLE 5: PREDICTION MODELS FOR PROGRAMS GROUPED URBAN-RURAL . . .	22
TABLE 6: PREDICTION MODELS FOR PROGRAMS GROUPED ON LENGTH OF PROGRAM	24
APPENDIX A: SURVEY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IN MICHIGAN AND DESCRIPTIVE RESULTS	27
APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER FROM MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION.	30
APPENDIX C: INSTRUCTIONS FOR RATING OF PROGRAMS	31

ABSTRACT

A 55-item questionnaire was distributed to all of the Community School Programs in Michigan which were partially reimbursed by the State in 1975-76. Ninety-eight percent of the questionnaires were returned. Thirteen components existed in over 90% of the Programs and are considered to be necessary for a viable Community School Program. The results of the study indicate that the necessary components for all Community Programs are:

1. The Board supports Community Education by opening the school building.
2. The Program attracts most segments of the community.
3. Program activities are started as soon as possible after needs have been identified.
4. An Advisory Committee is formed which helps to determine needs, establish goals, and identify community resources.
5. Director regularly attends inservice.
6. Program establishes cooperative efforts with governmental agencies, volunteer and civic service organizations, and other educational institutions.
7. Program has activities in the summer.
8. Evaluation of the Program is based to some extent on the data collected on participants.

In addition, components which differentiate successful from unsuccessful Programs were identified for Programs located in rural and urban areas, and for Programs in existence for 3 to 6 years, and in existence for over 6 years.

The additional components of successful rural Programs are:

- Serving a large number of districts,
- Director regularly attending inservice,
- Director teaching inservice,

- Director perceiving that the organizational structure of the Program is not at a minimum, and
- No activities in the summer.

The additional components of successful urban Programs are:

- Initial planning from as many community resources as possible,
- Written objectives in addition to those required by the State,
- Director receiving in-depth training at Flint, and
- Director feeling adequate in conducting a needs assessment.

The additional components of successful Programs in existence for 3 to 6 years are:

- Advisory Council helps publicize Program,
- Director regularly attends inservice,
- Director feels separate from the rest of the school administrative staff, and
- The Program bases the evaluation to some extent on data collected on participants.

The additional components of successful Programs in existence for more than 6 years are:

- Teenagers on Advisory Council,
- Advisory Council not publicize the Program,
- Director receiving training at Flint,
- There not being essentially the same number of activities for all age groups.

The following recommendations were made regarding further research in Community Education:

- Rely not on success ratings by Programs themselves, but utilize an objective measure or at least a subjective estimate by an outsider or group of outsiders.

- Require more extensive record keeping by the Programs of decisions and evaluative data.

The following recommendations seem warranted for Community Education Programs:

- Include teenagers on Advisory Councils.
- Develop means for fostering a more active Advisory Council.

The following recommendations seem warranted for a State Department of Education:

- Provide assistance/guidance in maintaining an active Advisory Council.
- Provide inservice for Directors in the area of needs assessment and evaluation or encourage the use of outside evaluators.
- Develop several objectives which are applicable to all Programs and/or require that all objectives meet certain minimum standards.

STUDY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION IN REGION V

REPORT I:

Components of Exemplary Community Education Programs in Michigan

Introduction

This project, a Study of Community Education in Region V, was funded by the Upper Midwest Regional Interstate Research Project Policy Committee in August of 1975. The Michigan Department of Education has coordinated the activities. This report deals with the first phase of the project: Community Education in Michigan. Subsequent reports will focus on the Community Education Programs in the other Region V States, and on the role of the State Directors of Community Education in the Region V States.

The major objective of the portion of the study represented by this report was to identify the components of exemplary Community Education Programs in Michigan. As will be discussed in further detail later, two kinds of components were identified in this study: 1) those components which are found in nearly every Program and are considered in this study to be necessary for a viable Program, but which do not distinguish between the most and least successful programs, and 2) those components which exist to a greater degree in the most successful programs.

A secondary objective was to obtain descriptive information on the components of Community Education Programs in Michigan. The development of the questionnaire which was used for data collection is discussed first, followed by the results: the descriptive program information and the exemplary program components.

The results of such an investigation should have relevance to the other states in Region V, as well as others.

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

An initial version of the "Survey of Community Education" was developed as a result of several information gathering activities. First, background research into the available literature on Community Education was conducted during May and June of 1975. In July, a visit was made with Dr. Cwik of the University of Michigan, Office of Community Education Research. Dr. Cwik made available all of the dissertations in the area. In addition, the National Center for Community Education in Flint, Michigan made available the Community Education Journals, and Dr. Kromer of the National Center for Community Education discussed aspects of Community Education.

The initial version of the questionnaire and several revisions were developed by the Project Director and were discussed with Gary Sullenger, the Community School Specialist, of the Michigan Department of Education.

While final decisions on the questionnaire were the responsibility of the Project Director, several individuals and groups provided valuable input. On August 21 and 22 1975, Gary Sullenger and the Project Director presented the basics of the study to a meeting of the Upper Midwest Regional Interstate Research Project Policy Committee at Madison, Wisconsin. Several changes were made in the instrument as a result of the discussions by the Policy Committee members. The instrument was also discussed with two Community Education Directors in Michigan, Eugene Fisher of Saline, and Don Kelso of Jackson. Both of these men provided excellent suggestions for the improvement of the survey. One final organization provided input to the survey--the Michigan Community School Education Association Board of Directors. Gary Sullenger presented the proposed study and survey instrument to them on September 5, 1975, and several members provided written comments.

The final questionnaire contained 55 items: 5 demographic items, 7 planning items, 7 items measuring support from various sources, 9 items relevant to the

Advisory Council, 9 items about the training and functions of the Director, 10 items relating to programming, and 8 items concerned with evaluation. All of the items (except the demographic ones) were in a YES-NO format in order to facilitate obtaining answers from the Directors. The two Directors who piloted the instrument took approximately 15 minutes each to respond.

On October 15, 1975, Dr. Mary T. Rogers (the Director of Adult and Continuing Education Services of the Michigan Department of Education) sent a letter to all Superintendents of Schools in Michigan which are reimbursed under the Community School Grant Program. The letter indicated the support of the Michigan Department of Education (MDE) (See Appendix B). On October 20, 1975 the questionnaire was mailed to the 198 Community School Directors in Michigan. Within two weeks, 152 questionnaires were returned. Approximately four weeks after the first letter was mailed, a second letter and questionnaire was mailed to those Directors who had not yet responded. In addition, most of those Directors were contacted by phone.

RESULTS

The results are divided into two major sections, the first presenting the descriptive information about the 194 responding Community School Programs (essentially all of the Community School Programs partially reimbursed by the State of Michigan). The proportion of YES responses to each item is also presented in Appendix A. The second section presents the results for the major objective of the study--the development of the predictive models identifying components of exemplary programs.

By the time data analysis began, 194 Directors had responded. Three other surveys were received too late to include in the analysis. Therefore, the final response rate was 98%.

Descriptive Results

Detailed descriptive results appear in tabular form in Appendix A. The results for the various areas are summarized and discussed below.

Demographic Item 1: Total population of area served was included to get an idea of the scope of the Program. The mean population size was 27,000 and the median was 20,000.

Demographic Item 2: Number of school districts served indicates that almost 3/4 of the Programs only served one district.

Demographic Item 3: Type of setting has been indicated by other researchers as an important aspect of the Community Education Program. Over half of the Programs were serving a "small town or village." These Programs were combined with those from "rural setting" to form a "rural group" for later analyses.

Demographic Item 4: Length of time the Program has operated is an important variable because it indicates the time span that the staff has had to develop activities. The time groupings are somewhat similar to previous research (O'Neil, 1972), but reflect the fact that the State of Michigan has been partially funding Programs for six years. Thus, Programs which have been in existence for more than 6 years (44%) began without State support. Programs which have only been in existence for 1-2 years (19%) were thought to possibly be different from the more established Programs, and so they were identified as a group, and separated from those existing for 3-6 years (37%).

Demographic Item 5: Percent of Program devoted to Education, Health, Leisure Time, Socialization, and Other. These categories are consistent with much of the literature and were used because they correspond to the areas on the application blank filled out by each of the Programs. Bush (1974) suggests that the better Programs are those which are diversified and focus their Program in the various areas.

Indeed, 22% of the Programs devoted at least 10% of their effort in each of the four areas. This 10% figure was adopted as an indication of a diversified effort.

The primary effort was in Education and Leisure Time. Very little effort was reported in the areas of Health and Socialization. Most frequently mentioned "Other" areas were "community problem solving," "public relations," and "senior citizens." (See Appendix A for further details.)

Planning Component: Seven items (items 6-12 in Appendix A) were developed from the work of Bergera (1972), Minzey (1975), Eyster (1975), Clark (1972), Parson (1974), Turnidge (1973), and Seay and Crawford (1954). Initial planning was not shared by all. About half of the Programs were influenced by an outside catalyst, and 3/4 of the Programs involve local elected officials.

Support from Various Sources: Seven items (items 13-19 in Appendix A) were developed from the work of Seay and Crawford (1954), Turnidge (1973), Parson (1974), Clark (1972), Koth (1973), and Baldasari (1972). Almost all of the Programs have written and financial support from their Boards. There is leadership and participation from most segments of the community. All but one Program reported that the Board supported the use of school buildings by the Community Education Program. About one-third of the Directors reported that school principals sometimes did not support their work with teachers.

Advisory Council Support: Nine items (items 20a-20i of Appendix A) were included on the questionnaire concerning the Advisory Council. The Michigan State Board of Education (1975) requires that each funded Program "demonstrate utilization of a form of a citizen's advisory council." Specific functions and structures of the Advisory Council have been identified by Parson (1974), Kerensky and Melby (1971), Bergera (1972), Baldasari (1972) and Johnson (1973). According to the Directors, a large proportion of the Programs have Councils which "act as a

sounding board rather than pass on action programs." According to the Directors, the Councils, though, help determine needs, help establish goals, help identify community resources, and help publicize the Program to the community. About half include teenagers on their Council and about half have a Council size within the optimum range identified by Baldasari (1972).

The Community School Director: Nine items (items 21-29) were included to measure the training and functions of the Director. The work of Turnidge (1973), Koth (1973), Parson (1974), and Clark (1972) was referred to, as well as suggestions from Community School personnel. Only about 3/4 of the Directors have had several courses in Community Education, whereas 90% have had coursework in Educational Administration. About 1/2 have had intensive training at Flint, while 58% have had training elsewhere (42% at various universities, and 16% "on the job"). Almost all regularly attend inservice, a requirement for State funding. Unfortunately, a substantial portion feel that they are separate from the rest of the school administrative staff, that they are inadequate in conducting a needs assessment, and that they have not had enough training to conduct an evaluation. This last inadequacy could be important as the Michigan State Board of Education (1975, p.2) requires an annual evaluation, and 87% of the Directors report that they perform the evaluation themselves.

Programming Components: Ten items (items 30a-36 in Appendix A) measuring programming activities were developed from the work of Seay and Crawford (1954), O'Neil (1972), Parson (1974), Clark (1972), and Kerensky and Melby (1971). Almost all Programs have established cooperative efforts with various agencies in the community. Almost half of the Directors do not feel that the organizational structure is at a minimum. Over half of the Directors report a change in philosophy since the Program's beginning, but many commented that the change was for the good. Although almost all Programs have activities in the summer, only one-fifth have essentially the same number of activities for all age groups.

Furthermore, over one-third report a lack of qualified staff to deliver the activities.

Evaluation Components: Eight items (items 37-44 in Appendix A) were developed from the work of Seay and Crawford (1954) and O'Neil (1972). Directors indicated that in the majority of the Programs: 1) activities are developed from continuous reevaluation of needs, 2) evaluation is based both on Participant's attitudes and on data other than attitudes, and 3) the Director completes an evaluation of the Program every year (required by the State of Michigan). Over one-third feel they spend too much time writing objectives and documenting results, and one-fourth would feel more comfortable if an outside consultant did the evaluation.

Necessary Components of Community Education Programs

As was noted above, two kinds of Program components were identified in this study: 1) those components which are found in nearly every Program, but which do not distinguish between the most and least successful Programs, and 2) those components which exist to a greater degree in the most successful Programs.

It was decided before the survey was mailed out to consider a component as "necessary" if over 90% of the Programs evidenced that component. This decision was made on the basis of two reasons. First, if essentially all Programs evidenced the component, one could consider such a component as a necessary, but not sufficient (for success) component. Secondly, if essentially all Programs evidenced a component, that component would have little statistical chance of appearing in the predictive model. Indeed, if all Programs evidenced the component, then there would be no way that that component could appear in the predictive model. It should be noted that it is, of course, possible that a component may exist in all current Programs merely as a matter of tradition

rather than because it is really necessary. Such a component might possibly be omitted from a successful Program in the future. Table 1 lists components which, as a result of this survey, are considered to be necessary but not sufficient components of successful Community Education Programs.

Table 1. Necessary Components of Community Education Programs in Michigan

Item #	
13	The Board passes a resolution supporting Community Education
16	Participation by most segments of the community
17	Activities started as soon as possible after need has been identified
18	Board supports the use of school buildings by the Community Education Program
20d	Advisory Committee helps determine needs of community
20e	Advisory Committee helps establish goals of the Program
20g	Advisory Committee helps identify community resources
25	Director regularly attends inservice on Community Education
30a	Program establishes cooperative efforts with governmental agencies
30b	Program establishes cooperative efforts with volunteer and civic service organizations
30d	Program establishes cooperative efforts with other educational institutions
33	Program has activities in the summer
38	Evaluation is based to some extent on data collected on participants

Measures of Program Success

In order to develop a prediction model identifying the components of exemplary Community Education Programs, not only do the components have to be measured, but also some rating or measure of success has to be obtained. The presence or absence in each Program of the various components was ascertained from the questionnaires returned by the 194 Directors as described in the previous section. In a separate aspect of the study, the Programs were

measured on three criteria of success. Each of these three measures of success was used separately as a criterion measure in regression analyses to determine predictors (components) of successful programs.

For the first measure of success, the administrator of the Michigan "Grants for Community School Program" was asked to rate the Programs. (See Appendix C for the specific instructions.) Gary Sellenger was asked to do this because he was in the best position to do the rating of all the Programs.

A second criterion of success was based on the Program's annual evaluation form and was the proportion of 1974-75 objectives which the Program reported were met. The Michigan Department of Education, in reviewing those evaluations made by the Programs themselves, made an evaluation of those evaluation forms. If the right kind of data was not presented, or if the evaluated objective was not in the original application, or if the data provided did not indeed meet the objective, then the objective was not considered to be met. Thus, the third criterion was the Michigan Department of Education assessment of proportion of 1974-75 objectives met.

Results for each of the three criteria of success are presented in this section, but major emphasis is placed on the first rating because it is considered by the Project Director to be the best measure of success. This is so because the Programs differed greatly with MDE on the proportion of objectives met. And furthermore, there was no effort to monitor the nature of the objectives. That is, some Programs may have submitted "easily obtainable" objectives at the beginning of the year and ended up successful. Other may have developed more difficult objectives and consequently had a more difficult time meeting them. Additionally, not all Directors place the same importance on the end of year evaluation. Even though the evaluation is a requirement for reimbursement, the requirement is simply that an evaluation be turned in. Some Programs have assistance in conducting the evaluation from other Departments in

the District that are somewhat sophisticated in Evaluation. And lastly, 20 Programs were new in 1975-76 and hence had no evaluative data, whereas they were rated and could be included when the rating was used as the criterion.

The rating, as indicated in Appendix C, was designed so as to end up with an approximately normal distribution. Table 2 provides the frequency and proportion in each level of the success rating.

Table 3 shows the distribution of the Programs on the two measures of success which were based on the proportion of objectives achieved (as estimated by the Programs and by the Michigan Department of Education). The discrepancy between the Program's estimate of the proportion of objectives met and that of the MDE can be ascertained in Table 3. It was partly this discrepancy that led to the primary emphasis on the rating described above.

Table 2. Rating of Programs

Description	%	Number
least successful	4	8
quite a bit below average	13	25
just below average	12	24
average for Michigan	31	61
just above average	23	44
quite a bit above average	12	23
most successful	5	9

Table 3. Proportion of Program Objectives Met: Program Estimate and Michigan Department of Education Estimate

Proportion of Objectives Met	Program Estimate		MDE Estimate	
	f	%	F	%
0- 9	1	1	41	24
10-19	0	0	3	2
20-29	4	2	37	21

Table 3. (continued)

Proportion of Objectives Met	Program Estimate		MDE Estimate	
30-39	0	0	9	5
40-49	3	2	11	6
50-59	21	12	27	16
60-69	14	8	14	8
70-79	24	14	19	11
80-89	20	11	2	1
90-100	87	50	11	6

Formulation of Prediction Models

Several prediction models were calculated. One was calculated using all Programs. In addition, models were calculated using subgroups of Programs, grouped on the basis of rural-urban and also on the basis of age of Program.

The literature suggests that different kinds of Program may be more effective in urban settings than in rural settings. If this is the case, these differences would not be detectable when considering all the Programs as a single group. Some literature suggested that differing components are important depending upon the age of the Program, hence the Programs were also grouped on the basis of length of existence. If these groupings are important, then the R^2 associated with the "grouped models" will be higher than the R^2 for the model on all Programs. The technique employed is one that is often used for this kind of model building, a forward stepwise regression procedure. [See Fox and Guire (1973) for a discussion of MIDAS program SELECT.] The technique includes in the prediction model those variables which together as a set best predict the criterion. Only those variables which significantly predict are included. The R^2 measure can range from .00 (accounting for none of the criterion variance) to 1.00 (accounting for all of the criterion

variance). The goal is thus to obtain an R^2 value close to 1.00. Adjusted R^2 values are also reported here, as the R^2 is unduly inflated by small sample sizes and large number of predictor variables (Guilford, 1965). [See McNeil, Kelly, and McNeil (1975) for a more complete discussion of regression analysis and of policy capturing in particular.]

Results: Components of Successful Programs

Table 4 presents the results when all Programs were analyzed on each of the three criteria of Program success. As discussed above, more confidence should be placed on the rating than on the other two criteria, and least confidence should be placed on the Program's own assessment of the proportion of objectives met. When predicting the criterion of rating, three predictors accounted for 7% of the criterion variance. The most successful Programs were those:

1) who had participation by most segments of the community

2) who have teenagers on the Advisory Council, and

3) whose Director has had several courses in Educational Administration.

In predicting the Program's estimate of success, only one variable was predictive of success--participants sharing in decision-making in all activities. But since the R^2 was only .01, little credence can be placed on this result. Three very different variables predicted the State Department's estimate of proportion of objectives met:

1) in-depth training at Flint,

2) Director <u>not</u> have substantial training elsewhere, and

3) the Director completing the evaluation every year.

Results: Components of Successful Urban and Rural Programs

Table 5 displays the results when the Programs were grouped on the basis of urban and rural Programs. Higher R^2 were obtained for these groupings, with

around one-fourth of the criterion variance of the rating being accounted for. Components predicting success for urban Programs were:

1) initial planning from as many community resources as possible,
2) writing objectives in addition to those required by the State,
3) Director receiving in-depth training at Flint, and
4) Director feeling adequate in conducting a needs assessment.

The first two of these components are Planning components, and the last two are related to the training of the Director. One interpretation of the above results is that the Director of an urban Program needs to be trained in one model and needs to be systematic in approach.

In predicting the rating criterion for rural Programs, the following components were significant:

1) large number of districts served,
2) Director regularly attending inservice,
3) Director traching inservice,
4) Director perceiving that the organizational structure of the Program is not at a minimum, and
5) no activities in the summer.

Contrary to expectations, the more successfully rated rural Programs served more districts. The more successful Programs had a Director active in attending inservice and teaching inservice, although for the rural communities the most successful Programs tended not to offer summer activities.

Results: Components of Successful Programs of Differing Length of Existence

Table 6 displays the results when the Programs were grouped on the basis of length of Program. The rating of "New Programs" was not predictable whereas about one-fourth of the variance of the other two lengths was predictable. For

Programs 3-6 years in existence, the four components predictive of the rating were:

1) Advisory Council helps publicize Program,

2) Director regularly attending inservice,

3) Director feeling separate from the rest of the school administrative staff, and

4) basing the evaluation to some extent on data collected on participants.

For Programs in existence for more than six years, the four components predictive of the rating were:

1) having teenagers on the Council,

2) Advisory Council not publicizing the Program to the community,

3) Director receiving training at Flint, and

4) there not being essentially the same number of activities for all age groups.

The major difference between the well-established Programs and those in existence for 3-6 years seems to be in the training of the Director and the viability of the Advisory Council. The well-established, successful Programs, while they have teenagers on the Council, do not appear to have active Councils, nor does the Program serve all ages equally. The successful Programs in existence for 3-6 years appear to have a more active Council and Director (although the Directors surprisingly tend to feel separate from the rest of the administrative staff).

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The major objective of this study was to ascertain the components of exemplary Community Education Programs. In studying the State-funded Programs in Michigan, the following conclusions can be made:

1) Only a small differentiation between successful and less successful Programs can be made when considering all Programs together--it is

more beneficial to group on the basis of rural-urban, or on the basis of how long the Program has been in existence.

2) About one-fourth of the variance in success can be accounted for with 4 to 5 components when Programs are grouped by rural-urban or by length of Program operation.

3) The components of successful Programs vary depending on what sub-group of Programs is under consideration: the previous section details those components.

The following recommendations seem warranted for further research in Community Education:

- Rely not on success ratings by Programs themselves, but utilize an objective measure or at least a subjective measure by an outsider or group of outsiders.
- Require more extensive record keeping by the Programs of decisions and evaluative data.

The following recommendations seem warranted for Community Education Programs:

- Include teenagers on Advisory Councils.
- Develop means for fostering a more active Advisory Council.

The following recommendations seem warranted for a State Department of Education:

- Provide assistance/guidance in maintaining an active Advisory Council.
- Provide inservice for Directors in the area of needs assessment and evaluation, or encourage the use of outside evaluators.
- Develop several objectives which are applicable to all Programs and/or require that all objectives meet certain minimum standards.

REFERENCES

Baldasari, P. A comparative study of the Community Education concept and selected Community Schools in Davis County. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Utah, 1972.

Berger, J. G. Five steps to a Community Education program. Community Education Journal, 1972, 4, 29.

Bush, D. O. Planning for Community Education. Community Education Journal, 1974, 6.

Clark, P. Guidelines for relating Community Education and the regular school instructional program. Community Education Journal, 1972, 1, 60-61.

Eyster, G. Some suggested guidelines for Community Education development. Community Education Journal, 1975, 1.

Fox, D. J. and Guire, K. E. Documentation for MIDAS, Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan, 1973.

Guilford, J. P. Fundamental Statistics in Psychology and Education, Fourth ed. McGraw-Hill: New York, 1965.

Johnson, W. D. Leadership training model for Community School directors. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1973.

Kerensky, V. M. and Melby, E. O. Education II Revisited: The Social Imperative. Midland, Michigan: Pendell Publishing Company, 1971.

Koth, A. The Do's and Don't's for a Community School Director. Community Education Journal, 1973, 2, 45-46.

McNeil, K. A., Kelly, F. J., and McNeil, J. T. Testing Research Hypotheses Using Multiple Linear Regression. Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press, 1975.

Michigan Department of Education. A description and evaluation of Community School Programs receiving partial reimbursement of Community School Directors/Coordinators salaries, 1972-73. MDE, 1973.

Michigan State Board of Education. Position paper on the Community School within the Philosophical concept of Community Education. August 13, 1975.

Minzey, J. Community Education and the Process of Change. Community Education Journal, 1975, 5.

O'Neil, W. F. The relationship of nationally accepted Community characteristics and their implementation with special emphasis on Community Councils in selected New England Community Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Wayne State University, 1972.

Parson, S. A survey of the extent to which components common to Community Education are present in Iowa Public Schools. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Western Michigan University, 1974.

Seay, M. F. and Crawford, F. N. The Community School and Community Self-Improvement. Lansing, Michigan: Superintendent of Public Instruction, 1954.

Turnidge, W. The characteristics of schools and communities associated with Community Education. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Arizona State University, 1973.

Table 4. Prediction Models for All Programs

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
All Programs	192	Rating	.08	.07	• participation by most segments of the community • have teenagers on the Advisory Council • Director has had several courses in Educational Administration
All Programs	172	Program Estimate	.02	.01	• Participants share in all aspects of decision-making
All Programs	172	MDE Estimate	.07	.05	• Director received in-depth training at Flint • Director does not receive substantial training elsewhere • Director completes evaluation every year

Table 5. Prediction Models for Programs Grouped Urban-Rural

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
Urban	80	Rating	.27	.24	• initial planning from as many community resources as possible • written objectives in addition to those required by the state • Director receiving in-depth training at Flint • Director feeling adequate in conducting a needs assessment
Rural	112	Rating	.25	.22	• large number of districts served • Director regularly attending inservice • Director teaching inservice • Director perceiving that the organizational structure of the Program is not at a minimum • no activities in Summer
Urban	70	Program	.17	.15	• Director received substantial training other than at Flint • no lack of qualified staff to deliver the activities

Table 5. (Continued)

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
Rural	102	Program Estimate	.14	.11	• Program participants share in decision-making • Program continues without state-financing • lack of qualified staff to deliver the activities
Urban	70	MDE Estimate	—	—	NONE
Rural	102	MDE Estimate	.16	.13	• Director received training at Flint • Director received training other than at Flint • Director would not feel more comfortable if an outside consultant did the evaluation

Table 6. Prediction Models for Programs Grouped on Length of Program

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
New Programs	35	Rating	—	--	NONE
3-6 Years	71	Rating	.31	.27	• Advisory Council helps publicize Program • Director regularly attending inservice • Director feeling separate from the rest of the school administrative staff • basing the evaluation to some extent on data collected on participants
6 + years	86	Rating	.29	.26	• having teenagers on the Council • Advisory Council not publiciiing the Program • Director receiving training at Flint • there not being essentially the same number of activities for all age groups
New Programs	26	Program Estimate	.95	.93	• many districts served • Advisory Council helps determine needs of community • Advisory Council helps establish goals of the Program • Director has had several courses in Community Education

Table 6. (Continued)

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
					• Programs not established cooperative efforts with governmental agencies
					• Program does not have activities in Summer
					• some data collected on participants' attitudes
					• not even emphasis in content areas
3-6 Years	66	Program Estimate	.13	.10	• Director not have had several courses in Educational Administration
					• Director teaches inservice
6 + Years	80	Program Estimate	.15	.13	• participants get to share in decision-making
					• teenagers not on Advisory Council
New Programs	26	MDE Estimate	.65	.58	• Program would continue if state withdrew funding
					• Director feels inadequate in conducting needs assessment
					• Program has not established cooperative efforts with volunteer and civic service organizations
					• same philosophy since inception of Program
3-6 Years	66	MDE	.35	.30	• Program would not continue if state funds were withdrawn
					• Advisory Council limits activities to discussion and making recommendations

Table 6. (Continued)

Group	Sample Size	Criterion	R^2	R^2 Corrected	Significant Predictive Components
					• Director not have had several courses in Educational Administration
					• Director received training at Flint
					• Program evaluation not based on data collected on participants
6 + Years	80	MDE Estimate	.13	.11	• outside middle person or organization did not act as a catalyst during planning
					• Director completes an evaluation of Program every year

APPENDIX A

SURVEY OF COMMUNITY EDUCATION

IN MICHIGAN

1 Total population of area served (include all ages and estimate to nearest 10,000) X = 27,000 Median = 20,000

2. School Districts Served (1-72%) (2-8%) (3-10%) (4-4%) (5-3%) (6-1%) (7-1%) (9-1%)

3. Type of setting which you serve (may check more than one)

A major city (more than 500,000)	.5%
Medium city (100,000 to 500,000)	4%
Suburb of medium or large city	21%
Small city (25,000 to 100,000)	16%
Small town or village	52%
Rural setting (farm, etc.)	7%

4. Length of time a formal Community Education Program has operated in your area

19%	37%	44%
1-2 yrs.	3-6 yrs.	more than 6 years

5. What percent of the Community Education Program is devoted to:

	0%	5% or less		10% or less	Less than 50%
Education	0%	1%	___%	4%	45%
Health	21%	51%	___%	77%	100%
Leisure Time (enrichment and recreation)	1%	2%	___%	3%	81%
Socialization	9%	29%	___%	34%	100%
Other (specify)	73%	82%	___%	94%	100%
Total			100 %		

% responding "Yes"--Please circle either "Yes" or "No" to each of the following questions. If you have some additional comments, please include them as well.

77 6 Yes No Was planning input during initial implementation from as many community resources as possible?

70 7 Yes No Were planning sessions held during initial implementation with all involved?

71 8 Yes No The State requires a list of objectives and an evaluation plan for those objectives. Do you have additional written objectives?

45 9 Yes No Did an outside middle-person or organization act as a catalyst during planning before implementation?

85 10 Yes No Does the professional staff of the Community Education Program have clear cut roles?

47 11 Yes No Do Program participants get to share in decision-making in all activities?

75 12 Yes No Have local elected officials (politicians) been involved in a meaningful fashion?

% responding "Yes"				
80	29	Yes	No	Do you feel that you have enough training to conduct an evaluation?
	30			Has your Community School Program established cooperative efforts with:
97	30a	Yes	No	Governmental agencies?
96	30b	Yes	No	Volunteer and civic service organizations?
82	30c	Yes	No	Business and industry?
96	30d	Yes	No	Other educational institutions?
60	31	Yes	No	Is the organizational structure of the Community Education Program at a minimum?
42	32	Yes	No	Has there been the same philosophy of Community Education since the inception of the Community School Program?
96	33	Yes	No	Does the Community School Program have activities in the summer?
22	34	Yes	No	Are there essentially the same number of activities for all age groups (0-4; 5-17; 18-64; 65 and older)?
37	35	Yes	No	Is there a lack of qualified staff to deliver the activities?
59	36	Yes	No	Do you find it diffucult to maintain an active advisory council?
88	37	Yes	No	Are the curriculum and activities developed from continuous reevaluation of needs?
96	38	Yes	No	Is the evaluation based to some extent on data collected on participants?
82	39	Yes	No	Is there an updating of objectives, or an annual needs assessment?
80	40	Yes	No	Is some data collected on participant's attitudes?
89	41	Yes	No	Is there some data collected on the participants other than their attitudes?
87	42	Yes	No	Do you yourself complete an evaluation of the Community Education Program every year?
25	43	Yes	No	Would you feel more comfortable if an outside consultant did the evaluation?
39	44	Yes	No	Do you feel you spend too much time writing objectives and documenting results?

% responding "Yes"				
96	13	Yes	No	Has the Board passed a resolution supporting Community Education?
90	14	Yes	No	If State partial salary reimbursement was withdrawn, would Community Education continue in your area?
82	15	Yes	No	Is there leadership involvement from most segments of the community?
93	16	Yes	No	Is there participation by most segments of the community?
97	17	Yes	No	Are activities started as soon as possible after need has been identified?
99	18	Yes	No	Does the Board support the use of school buildings by the Community Education Program?
32	19	Yes	No	Do the Principals sometimes not support your work with teachers?
	20			Does the Community Education Advisory Council:
68	20a	Yes	No	Act as a sounding board, rather than pass on action programs?
58	20b	Yes	No	Limit activities to discussion and making recommendations?
59	20c	Yes	No	Have teenagers as Council members?
96	20d	Yes	No	Help determine needs of community?
95	20e	Yes	No	Help establish goals of the Program?
87	20f	Yes	No	Help publicize the Program to the community?
96	20g	Yes	No	Help identify community resources?
89	20h	Yes	No	Leave budget making to the Director?
56	20i	Yes	No	Have a membership size between 15 and 25?
78	21	Yes	No	Have you had several courses in Community Education?
90	22	Yes	No	Have you had several courses in Educational Administration?
48	23	Yes	No	Did you receive in-depth training in excess of two consecutive weeks at Flint?
58	24	Yes	No	Have you received substantial training in Community Education somewhere other than Flint? If so, where _____.
93	25	Yes	No	Do you regularly attend inservice Community Education?
21	26	Yes	No	Do you feel that you are separate from the rest of the school administrative staff?
65	27	Yes	No	Do you yourself teach any inservice?
23	28	Yes	No	Do you feel inadequate in conducting a needs assessment?

APPENDIX B: COVER LETTER DISTRIBUTED BY MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION

JOHN W. PORTER
Superintendent of
Public Instruction

Adult and Continuing Education Services
P. O. Box 420
Lansing, Michigan 48902

STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION
MARILYN JEAN KELLY
President
DR. GORTON RIETHMILLER
Vice President
EDMUND F. VANDETTE
Secretary
ANNETTA MILLER
Treasurer
BARBARA A. DUMOUCHELLE
DR. PAUL B. HENRY
BARBARA J. ROBERTS
NORMAN OTTO STOCKMEYER, SR.
GOV. WILLIAM G. MILLIKEN
Ex-Officio

Dear Superintendent:

On May 1, 1975, the State of Michigan was selected by the Upper Midwest Regional Interstate Research Project Policy Committee to conduct a study on Community Education. This study is designed to collect and identify common elements of exemplary community school programs. Funding for this study is provided by P.L. 89-10, ESEA Title V, Sec. 505 as amended, through the U. S. Office of Education. The State Department of Education along with the Upper Midwest Regional Interstate Research Project Policy Committee is inviting all public school districts participating in the 1975-76 Community School Grant Program to assist us.

Dr. Keith McNeil of Educational Monitoring Systems Inc., has been awarded the contract to do this study. Your particular school district will not be identified by name in the final report. Dr. McNeil will be in touch with you through a survey form. Will you please have your "contact person" for the 1975-76 Community School Grant Program complete the survey instrument. This letter comes to alert you to the study. If you have any additional questions, please write or call Gary L. Sullenger, Specialist, Community School Program, at 517/373-9575.

Sincerely yours,

Mary T. Rogers

Mary T. Rogers, Director
Adult and Continuing Education Services

MICHIGAN
THE GREAT LAKES STATE

EDUCATIONAL MONITORING SYSTEMS INC.

3449 RENTZ – ANN ARBOR, MICHIGAN 48103 – 475-2453

Oct. 25,1975

Dear Gary,

I need to get an estimate of the success of each of the Community School programs in the State of Michigan. Use your own criterion of success, but try to be consistent in rating the whole program. I would like you to place the programs in seven piles, with more programs in the middle than at the two ends. That is, you will be forced to identify fewer extremely successful programs than average programs. Enclosed are seven envelopes. Please spread them in front of you, with the envelope marked "1" on your left, the one marked "2" just to the right of it, and so on. Note the qualifying adjectives on the envelopes. Now take the mailing labels for each Community School program and place each one on top of the envelope which best describes that program, in relation to all other programs in the State of Michigan. You might want to keep in mind the number limits indicated on the envelopes. After you have rated all the programs, pick up the envelope marked "7", and count the number of programs that you have placed on that envelope. If you have less than 8, or more than 12, rearrange so that you are within the count. (If you have more than 12, put the least successful on envelope #6. If you have less than 8, (say 6), look for the best two programs of those you placed on envelope #6.) Rearrange the remaining envelopes so you are within the following distribution: #1:8-10 #2:20-25 #3:40-45 #4:60-65 #5:40-45 #6:20-25 #7:8-10. When you are within these counts, put the address labels into the envelopes and return to me. Thanks a lot in advance.

DE 008150